



Larry Fenster
Senior Economist
Law and Public Policy
1133 19th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-736-6513

January 31, 2005

Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12 St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: MCI's 2005 Special Report on the Status of Waived VRS 911 Requirements,
CC Docket No. 98-67, WC Docket 03-123**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Please find attached MCI's Special 2005 Report on the Feasibility of providing automatic location information to the appropriate public service answering point via IP-Relay and Video Relay Services.

If you have any questions please contact me at the above-listed number

Sincerely,

/s/Larry Fenster

Larry Fenster

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
Telecommunications Relay Services and)	
Speech-to-Speech Services for)	CC Docket No. 98-67
Individuals with Hearing and Speech)	WC Docket No. 03-123
Disabilities)	

**SPECIAL REPORT ON WAIVED AUTOMATICAL LOCATION
INFORMATION FOR INTERNET-BASED RELAY SERVICES (IP-
RELAY AND VRS)**

COMMENTS OF MCI

In an email dated January 12, 2005, Thomas Chandler, Chief of the Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, sent MCI and other relay providers an email seeking current comment on their ability to meet the waived video relay service (“VRS”) requirement to provide automatic location information to the appropriate public service answering point (“PSAP”). Heretofore, the requirement to provide automatic location information and pass

that information to the appropriate PSAP has been waived for both IP-Relay and VRS.¹

The Bureau, in its email, noted it was seeking this information for two reasons. Firstly, because the waiver for this VRS feature is set to expire January 1, 2006, and secondly, Communications Services for the Deaf, Inc petitioned the Commission to permit reimbursement for the costs of researching and developing solutions allow automatic location information to be passed to the appropriate public service answering point (PSAP), since heretofore the Commission has not reimbursed non-mandatory services such as IP-Relay and VRS for research and development costs.²

Although the Bureau asks for the record to be refreshed solely with regard to VRS, the issue is no different with respect to IP-Relay. Both are non-mandatory services, neither is reimbursed for research and development, and both are Internet-based services that do not receive automatic number information, which is the basis upon which delivery of automatic location information can

¹ See *Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, Order, CC Docket No. 98-67, DA 01-3029, 17 FCC Rcd 157 (Dec. 31, 2001) (*VRS Waiver Order*); and *Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, Order, CC Docket No. 98-67, FCC 02-121, 17 F.C.C.R. 7779 (2002) (*IP-Relay Order*).

² Communication Service for the Deaf, Petition for Reconsideration, *Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, Order, CC Docket No. 98-67, filed September 30, 2004.

currently be delivered to the appropriate PSAP. MCI's comments will therefore treat both services in the same manner with regard to this issue.

In its Annual Report on the Status of Waived IP-Relay Services, MCI stated that IP-Relay providers do not have the originating automatic numbering information (ANI) of the calling party, and therefore do not have the information needed to automatically identify the caller's location.³ That still remains the case today. For this reason, MCI's IP-Relay.com website informs callers that they should use their TTY and telephone when contacting 911. This still remains the case with VRS as well.

MCI agrees with Communication Services for the Deaf ("CSD") that Internet-based relay providers should not be required to offer this 911 capability if Internet relay providers are not reimbursed for research and development costs to make this possible. MCI does not expect this capability to be available in the near future. Nor should the relay industry be required to bear the costs of developing this solution. The issue of the delivery of automatic location information to the appropriate PSAP is one with which the entire voice over the Voice over the Internet ("VoIP") industry is grappling. It makes most sense to ultimately deliver this information (possibly along with other relevant medical information) to the

³ Annual Report On Waived IP-Relay Services WorldCom, Inc.d/b/a/ MCI, *In the Matter of Provision of Improved Telecommunications Relay services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, CC Docket No. 98-67, filed rel April 16, 2004, at 3.

PSAP in an IP-IP format. But PSAPs do not have the funding to purchase facilities that allow information to be received in this format. Nor is there a firm consensus on interim solutions, let alone universal implementation. Finally, PSAPs do not have the capability of receiving video transmissions, nor do they currently have video interpreters on staff that could handle VRS calls.

Therefore, at a minimum, the Commission should waive the requirement to provide automatic location information until the VoIP and PSAP community have developed and implemented the delivery of location information in an IP-IP format, PSAPs have the capability of handling a VRS transmission, and have a sufficient staff of certified video interpreters. At that point, the Commission may, upon its own motion, issue a Public Notice calling for comment whether IP-enabled relay providers (both IP-Relay and VRS) are able to provide automatic location information to the appropriate PSAP; how long this would take, and at what expense. The Commission should consider reimbursement at that point. Until then, the Commission should indefinitely waive this requirement for both IP-Relay and VRS. MCI hereby makes this request.

MCI understands the Commission does not lightly permanently waive a rule requirement. MCI's proposal would not involve a permanent waiver. It would merely place the onus of develop a solution on the VoIP and Video over IP industry as a whole, rather on Internet-based relay providers who are a small component of this industry. The VoIP and video over IP industries do not provide

location capability, hence Internet-based relay consumers would not be placed in a position of receiving less than functionally equivalent service if this capability were not made available before the entire Voice and Video over IP industry.

For this reason, MCI requests the Commission to waive the requirement to provide automatic location information for both IP-Relay and VRS until developments for the Voice and Video over IP industry demonstrate that automatic location solutions have been implemented. At that time the Commission should issue a Public Notice calling for comment on whether IP-enabled relay providers (both IP-Relay and VRS) are able to provide automatic location information to the appropriate PSAP; how long this would take, and at what expense; and other relevant questions.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted

/s/ Larry Fenster
Larry Fenster
1133 19th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-736-6513

cc: Thomas Chandler, Director, Disability Rights Office

Statement of Verification

I have read the foregoing, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, there is good ground to support it, and it is not interposed for delay. I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 31, 2005

/s/Larry Fenster

Larry Fenster

1133 19th St., NW

Washington, DC 20036

202-736-6513